

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 23, 24 and 32 have been amended by the present Amendment.
Amended claims 1, 23, 24 and 32 do not introduce any new subject matter.

Claims 7, 8 and 29-31 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-2, 6, 12-15, 18-25, 28-33, 37 and 41-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0003571 ("Schofield").

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of: (1) claims 3-5, 7-11, 34-36 and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield in view of WO 02/073964 ("Wong"); and (2) claims 16-17, 26-27 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield

Claims 1 and 23 recite, *inter alia*, at least one strap that passes through a groove positioned between a front wall and a back wall of the video display device.

Claim 32 recites, *inter alia*, that the membrane is made from a material having greater flexibility than the body portion, and is connected to the body portion at top, bottom, left and right sides.

Applicant respectfully submits that Schofield, when taken alone, or in combination with Wong does not disclose or suggest the strap configuration or the membrane as claimed.

Claims 1 and 23

The cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed strap that passes

through a groove positioned between front and back walls of the display device.

For example, referring to Fig. 3C of Applicant's disclosure, a strap 15 passes through a groove 17 located between front and back walls 11 and 12. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, in Wong, the clips 74 mount to the back wall of the VDU 36, and are not between front and back walls of the VDU 36 as claimed. In addition, in contrast to the Examiner's conclusion, the elements 1212 and 1212' in Fig. 12 of Schofield are not straps, but instead are adhesive mounting members attached to a vehicle windshield. See Schofield, ¶ 0273.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 23 are not anticipated by Schofield, and are patentable over Schofield, when taken alone, or in combination with Wong.

In addition, for at least the reason that claims 2-6 and 9-22 depend from claim 1, and claims 24-28 depend from claim 23, claims 2-6, 9-22 and 24-28 are also submitted not to be anticipated by and to be patentable over the cited references, claims 7, 8 and 29-31 having been canceled.

Claim 32

The cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed membrane that is made from a material having greater flexibility than the body portion, and that is connected to the body portion at top, bottom, left and right sides.

For example, Applicant's disclosure states that the body portion 105 is formed to be semi-rigid, and that the membrane is formed of a thin and bendable material, so that the flexibility of the membrane allows display devices of different sizes and thicknesses to be inserted in the support structure. Furthermore, Applicant's disclosure states that

the membrane 125 can remain flat against the body portion 105 when a display device is not inserted in the support structure. See, e.g., Applicant's disclosure, ¶¶ 0040 and 0045, and Figs. 5A-5E.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, what the Examiner refers to as membranes in Schofield (elements 6730 and 6738 in Fig. 67), are not made from materials having greater flexibility than what the Examiner calls the body portion (element 6731). Indeed, the elements 6730 and 6738 appear to be made from solid non-flexible material, and element 6731 is not a body portion, but is actually a video screen. See Schofield, ¶ 0399 and Fig. 67.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 is not anticipated by Schofield, and is patentable over Schofield, when taken alone, or in combination with Wong.

In addition, for at least the reason that claims 33-55 depend from claim 32, claims 33-55 are also submitted not to be anticipated by and to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-2, 6, 12-15, 18-25, 28-33, 37 and 41-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and of claims 3-5, 7-11, 16-17, 26-27, 34-36, 38-40 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicant submits that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, *supra*, the

dependent claims are also allowable. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Michael F. Morano".

Michael F. Morano
Reg. No. 44,952
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
(516) 692-8888